

Certification under 37 CFR 1.8b

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to Fax No. (703) 308-7382 on June 18, 2002.

Brian W. Hameder  
Name

Brian W. Hameder  
Signature

DOCKET: CU-1962

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: In Cheol PARK et al )Group Art Unit: 2871  
SERIAL NO: 09/345,270 )Examiner: D. Nguyen  
FILED: June 30, 1999 )  
)EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
)RESPONSE AFTER  
FINAL

TITLE: REFLECTIVE LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY OF HIGH APERTURE  
RATIO, HIGH TRANSMITTANCE AND WIDE VIEWING ANGLE

Box AF  
THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

FAX COPY RECEIVED

RESPONSE

JUN 18 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Sir:

This is in response to the Final Office Action dated December 18, 2001 and having a shortened statutory period for reply set to expire on March 18, 2002, and the Advisory Action dated March 28, 2002. Applicants submit the following response in the above-identified application. Also submitted with this amendment is a Request for Continued Examination with a Request for three-month Extension with the required fees, to extend the period of reply to June 18, 2002. Applicants believe this response places the application in better condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, dated December 18, 2001, the Examiner states that Claims 1-31 are pending, Claims 1-20 are rejected, and Claims 21-31 are removed from consideration.

In the Office Action, the Patent Office rejects Claims 1-3, 9, 10, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the Applicants' admitted prior art (APA), in view of

view of Ota et al., Hiroshi, and Lee et al. (US 5,886,762). Applicants respectfully disagree with these objections.

The present invention as claimed provides a reflective liquid crystal display using a fringe field and characterized in that the electrodes are made of a transparent conductor and the distance between substrates is greater than the distance between the electrodes. In addition, the present invention as claimed is characterized in that a quarter wave plate is sandwiched between a lower substrate and a reflective plate.

Accordingly, in the present invention, both counter and pixel electrodes are made of transparent materials, and the distance between the electrodes is narrower than the cell gap so that a plurality of fringe field are formed. Also, the width of the liquid crystal molecules are formed narrow enough to drive the liquid crystal molecules formed in both sides of the electrodes, thereby driving all liquid crystal molecules in the upper portions of the electrodes.

In contrast, Ota et al. provides an active matrix type liquid crystal display apparatus having a high aperture ratio, which uses the latter display mode and is prevented from generating orientation failure domains.

Channin provides a liquid crystal lens display system comprising a liquid crystal lens, display elements, a polarizer and a light source.

Hiroshi relates to an IPS (In-Plane-Switching) liquid crystal display that exhibits a wide viewing angle, and which discloses that the distance between two adjacent electrodes 48 and 49 is less than the thickness of the liquid crystal layer.

The technical differences between the present invention and these references is as follows. Ota et al. relates to the active matrix type liquid crystal display apparatus but does not disclose a reflective liquid crystal display using fringe fields and a quarter wave plate sandwiched between a lower substrate and a reflective plate as claimed in the present invention. In addition, Channin and Hiroshi do not teach a reflective liquid crystal display using fringe fields, electrodes made of a transparent material, or quarter wave plate sandwiched between a lower substrate and a reflective plate, as claimed in the present invention.

Accordingly, the present invention as claimed differs from cited patents in view of the applied field of the invention, the use of fringe field, the electrodes made of a


Response after filing a Request for Continued Examination. It should be noted that this is the first instance the Applicants' undersigned attorney has had in reviewing this matter; the propriety of the Action recognized.

However, in view of the requirement that prosecution be advanced, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the FINAL STATUS of the rejection so as to provide a means for developing claim amendments that would better present this application in a form ready for allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to obtain authorization of the Supervisory Patent Examiner in the event that there is any problem to extend the above requested relief.

July 10, 2002  
Date

Respectfully submitted,



Vangelis Economou -Reg. No. 32,341  
c/o Ladas & Parry  
224 South Michigan Avenue - Suite 1200  
Chicago Illinois 60604  
Tel. No. (312) 427-1300

FAX COPY RECEIVED

JUL 10 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800